

ST#2
6-4-02

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS: Beckhart, Conarro and Farivar-Sadri

EXAMINER:

SERIAL NO.:

ART GROUP:

FILED: Herewith

CASE NO.: MCT-0103

TITLE: Semiconductor Cassette Reducer

11002 U.S. PTO
10/035644
12/28/01

Law Office of Dale B. Halling
24 S. Weber St., Suite 311
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
December 28, 2001

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.97

Honorable Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.99, a supplemental list of documents is disclosed that may be material to the examination of this application. A copy of each of the documents is included herewith for the Examiner's consideration.

No inference should be drawn that the attached list represents a comprehensive investigation of the prior art; that any or all are pertinent to the invention; that the apparatus therein is analogous to the invention; or that any apparatus disclosed is the equivalent of the subject invention.

In addition, the applicant discloses the following:

The applicant has sold a different unsuccessful version of the semiconductor cassette reducer more than a year before the filing date of this application. The earlier version had at least the following differences: 1) a single retention spring in the original design; 2) solid U-shaped arms without cutouts in the original design, 3) four column wafer supports and no wafer support panels in the original design; 4) the arms on the U-shaped plates were longer so that the original U-shaped plates had the same length as the FOUP in the original design and 5) the original design did not have base cutouts. The single retention spring was found not to hold the cassette reducer in the FOUP. The lack of cutouts in the U-shaped arms resulted in the reducer not fitting into some FOUPs. The lack of wafer support panels resulted in a failure to provide adequate support for the wafers. The longer arms did not allow for adjusting the center of the wafer and made it difficult for robot end effectors to reach the semiconductor wafers. The lack of base cutouts made it difficult for the robot end effectors to reach wafers near the top or bottom of the cassette reducer. The claims

incorporate at least one of these differences as a result all claims are allowable over the original design

All of the applicant's claims are believed to be allowable over the references discussed above.

Respectfully submitted,

(Beckhart et al.)

By: 

Dale B. Halling
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,170
Phone: (719)-447-1990
Fax: (719) 447-9815